UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,654	07/03/2003	Gad Keren	022352-000310	7244
20350 7590 01/18/2007 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			EXAMINER	
			DESANTO, MATTHEW F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		3763	-
-			·	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	01/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		\mathcal{M}				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/613,654	KEREN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Matthew F. DeSanto	3763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 N</u>	lovember 2006.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under b	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 33 and 36-41 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 33 and 36-41 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob-	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receiv nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/31/04, 4/18/05, 7/1/04	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is withdrawn because of the preliminary amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 33, 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leschinsky (US 2001/0029349).

Leschinsky discloses in figure 6, a system for affecting a renal system comprising a local renal drug delivery catheter with a first and second portion and a second end portion comprising a first and second conduit (160,162) that extend distally from the first end portion, wherein the first and second conduits is coupled to a source of fluid agent (para [0050], [0051]), wherein the second end portion is adapted to be delivered, in a first condition with the first and second conduits at radially collapsed positions relative to each other, transverse to the longitudinal axis, at least in part to a location associated with first and second renal artery osita along an abdominal aorta; and wherein the first and second conduit can deliver fluid into the arteries simultaneously. Leschinsky fails to disclose the specific drugs being claimed.

Although Leschinsky does not teach the specific drugs claimed, Leschinsky does teach that the set maybe used to administer "all types of medical drugs or serums."

Art Unit: 3763

Since Leschinsky is taught as a device for "treating kidney diseases" (paragraph [0010]), it would have been obvious to include a drug adapted to affect renal function as claimed. Applicant claims a wide range of renal drugs, both broadly by function, and narrowly by name. In Applicant's own specification, at page 2 lines 4-13. Applicant discloses that administration of these drugs are "previously known methods" of treating acute renal (kidney) failure. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to administer these using the device of Leschinsky.

The examiner would like to note, that MPEP section 2114 states, that in order to receive an apparatus patent, there must be some structurally different elements, and recommends that the applicant incorporates the structure that is different and that allows the claimed invention to perform the different function then the prior art

- 3. Claims 33, 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi (USPN 6,482,211).
- 4. Choi discloses in figure 20, a system for affecting a renal system comprising a local renal drug delivery catheter with a first and second portion and a second end portion comprising a first and second conduit (23, 30) that extend distally from the first end portion, wherein the first and second conduits is coupled to a source of fluid agent (Column 12, lines 1-10), wherein the second end portion is adapted to be delivered, in a first condition with the first and second conduits at radially collapsed positions relative to each other, transverse to the longitudinal axis, at least in part to a location associated

Application/Control Number: 10/613,654

Art Unit: 3763

with first and second renal artery osita along an abdominal aorta; and wherein the first and second conduit can deliver fluid into the arteries simultaneously. Choi fails to disclose the specific drugs being claimed.

Although Choi does not teach the specific drugs claimed, Leschinsky does teach that the set maybe used to administer "for drug delivery." Since Choi taught a device that can be used with bifurcated vessel for treating certain conditions and can be modified by one of ordinary skill in art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a drug adapted to affect renal function as claimed. Applicant claims a wide range of renal drugs, both broadly by function, and narrowly by name. In Applicant's own specification, at page 2 lines 4-13. Applicant discloses that administration of these drugs are "previously known methods" of treating acute renal (kidney) failure. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to administer these using the device of Choi.

5. The examiner would like to note, that MPEP section 2114 states, that in order to receive an apparatus patent, there must be some structurally different elements, and recommends that the applicant incorporates the structure that is different and that allows the claimed invention to perform the different function then the prior art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew F. DeSanto whose telephone number is 571-272-4957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick LUCCHESI can be reached on (571) 272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matthew DeSanto

Art Unit 3763

January 7, 2007